

REMARKS

Claims 66-127 were pending in this application.

All of the claims stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,698,021 issued to Amini et al.

By way of this amendment, the Applicant amends Claims 66, 69, 92, 96, 100, 101, 104, 107, 119, and 123 and cancels claims 70 and 105.

Accordingly, Claims 66-69, 71-104, and 106-127 are currently pending.

I. **Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 66-127 remain rejected under Section 102 as being unpatentable over Amini.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application contains subject matter that is patentable over Amini. The fundamental difference between the camera control system in Amini and the claimed invention is the manner in how the camera control commands are being generated. The Examiner's attention is directed to Figs. 10A-10C in Amini and Fig. 4 of the present application. As can be seen in the Figs. 10A-10C in Amini, the camera control commands are being generated through use of buttons and slider-type controls. This is also fully supported in the disclosure at column 15, lines 45-65; column 14, lines 15-25 and lines 30-50; where Amini refers to "VCR-type controls," "activation of a button" and "point and click on button". The office action explicitly states, on pages 2-3, that scroll bars are used for camera control. Comparing Fig. 4 of the present application to Amini, the camera control commands in the present invention are not generated by buttons, sliders, or VCR-type controls, but by the position of a cursor (76) within a control area (72). This is also supported in the specification at paragraphs [0037] – [0043]. Furthermore, the speed and direction (Pan, tilt, zoom) of the camera control commands can be generated with respect to an origin point (74) and the distance of the cursor (76) to that origin point (74). Amini makes no mention of using cursor position to control the camera view, not even at column 8, lines 1-17 as the Examiner previously

suggested. Column 8, lines 1-17 in Amini are referring to a program that returns the camera to a preset starting point after a user-defined period of inactivity by the operator to prevent the loss of surveillance data.

Also, use of a cursor (76) within a control area (72) provides significant advantages over the camera control system disclosed in Amini. First, it provides for finer and more precise control of the selected camera. Second, the interface of the present invention is more intuitive to use for the operators of the system because they can simply point to what they want to look at rather than adjust controls. Third, the system provides for a more fluid viewing experience, because the camera control commands are generated variably depending upon the distance and rate at which the cursor (76) is moved within the control area (72). The camera control system in Amini is not capable of executing these features because of the inherent limitations of using buttons, slider controls, and other familiar or similar software control widgets and tools.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow the claims as amended.

Amini also does not provide for any mechanism to resolve conflicts between multiple requests to control the same camera by multiple users. Although Amini suggests that multiple client workstations (322) may view and control cameras within the system, no solution is present for conflict resolution between multiple, or simultaneous, requests by multiple client workstations (322) for the same camera. This leads to disadvantages that the invention of the present application overcomes. First, a user that gains control of a camera may be able to monopolize it indefinitely without any recourse for the other users of the system. Second, multiple users may be able to issue camera commands simultaneously with the consequences of erratic camera behavior and/or the application crashing. The only fail-safe present in Amini is the provision for a CameraReturn application (530) (start at column 7 line 65 and preceding onto column 8, line 15) that moves the camera back to a preset start position after the user has relinquished control

of the camera in order to prevent the loss of surveillance video. This application, however, does not resolve conflicts between multiple users.

On the other hand, the invention of the present application specifically provides for a queuing system where multiple requests can be resolved so camera viewing time is equitably (or according to some other criteria) distributed among the users of the system. See paragraphs [0049] through [0057] of the instant application. The invention of the present application also specifically provides for a "system administrator" category of user to have the power to usurp control of a camera from another user. See paragraph [0053]. The invention of the present application also allows multiple clients/users to interact through a chat system while viewing the same camera content. See paragraph [0058].

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow the claims as amended.

II. Conclusion

The Applicant submits that Claims 66-69, 71-104, and 106-127, as amended, are allowable over the cited prior art. In view of the above, the Applicant submits that pending Claims 66-69, 71-104, and 106-127 are now in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection and allow the claims as amended.

/


//

///

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned should any questions arise.

Dated: 5/16/05

Respectfully submitted,



Joshua A. Stockwell, Esq.

Registration No. 54,580

BARLOW, JOSEPHS & HOLMES, LTD.

101 Dyer Street, 5th Floor

Providence, RI 02903

Tel: 401-273-4446

Fax: 401-273-4447